1	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Bureau Exhibit 4 is objected to? I
2	will receive Bureau Exhibit 4.
3	(Whereupon, the document previously
4	marked for identification as Bureau
5	Exhibit 4 was received into
6	evidence.)
7	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Bureau Exhibit 13, which is Form,
8	Form 1023 for Translator TV, Inc.
9	MR. COHEN: I have 11, Your Honor, as the next one.
10	Am I in error?
11	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Bureau Exhibit 11 has been
12	received.
13	MR. COHEN: Thank you. Twelve, too?
14	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Twelve has also been received.
15	MR. COHEN: Thank you.
16	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Thirteen is the next one.
17	MR. TOPEL: It's the same argument that was made
18	with respect to Glendale's offer of information filed with the
19	Internal Revenue Service. I have nothing to add to that.
20	You've ruled.
21	JUDGE CHACHKIN: All right, Bureau Exhibit 13 is
22	received.
23	(Whereupon, the document previously
24 25	marked for identification as Bureau
2.3	Exhibit 13 was received into

1	evidence.)
2	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Sixteen? Objection to that?
3	MR. TOPEL: Not, not in light of the rulings you've
4	made, Your Honor.
5	JUDGE CHACHKIN: All right, Bureau Exhibit 16 is
6	received.
7	(Whereupon, the document previously
8	marked for identification as Bureau
9	Exhibit 16 was received into
10	evidence.)
11	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Eighteen. Is there I need to
12	I, I think standing alone the document is irrelevant. If the
13	Bureau represents that it intends to tie it up or try to tie
14	up somehow, I would reserve my right to move to strike it.
15	MR. SHOOK: We so intend, Your Honor.
16	JUDGE CHACHKIN: All right, Bureau Exhibit 18 is
17	received.
18	(Whereupon, the document previously
19	marked for identification as Bureau
20	Exhibit 18 was received into
21	evidence.)
22	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Now we have 21.
23	MR. COHEN: Has 20 been admitted, Your Honor?
24 25	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Twenty-one was received, yes
	MR. COHEN: Twenty.

1	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Twenty was received, yes.
2	MR. COHEN: Thank you.
3	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Twenty-one.
4	MR. TOPEL: I, I will withdraw my objection subject
5	to it being tied. Neither of the parties to this letter are
6	witnesses, to my knowledge, but if the Bureau is going to
7	intend to tie it. Again, on, on its face, I don't think it
8	relates to the, the points that I've made about the filing of
9	minority certification and <u>de facto</u> control but, but I, I will
10	withdraw an objection subject to it being tied.
11	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Bureau Exhibit 21 is received.
12	(Whereupon, the document previously
13	marked for identification as Bureau
14	Exhibit 21 was received into
15	evidence.)
16	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Twenty-two? Now, this is directed
17	to Miss Duff at TBN. Any objection?
18	MR. TOPEL: Yes, Your Honor. Let, let me, let me
19	say that, that, obviously, as we, as we started this morning,
20	it, it is not our view of relevance that everything that
21	Mrs. Duff did is necessarily relevant to the issues in this
22	case, and we would think that this occurring so far before the
23	minority preferences and so far the de so, so far before
24	there being any operating authorizations doesn't relate to the
25	designated issues but, again, you've ruled on my position, so

1	subject to it being tied up I have no problem.
2	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Bureau Exhibit 22 is received.
3	(Whereupon, the document previously
4	marked for identification as Bureau
5	Exhibit 22 was received into
6	evidence.)
7	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Bureau Exhibit 23?
8	MR. TOPEL: Oh, I'm
9	JUDGE CHACHKIN: It's a letter from Mr. Dunne to
10	Miss Duff.
11	MR. TOPEL: Yeah, it's in the same category,
12	Your Honor.
13	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Bureau Exhibit 23 is received.
14	(Whereupon, the document previously
15	marked for identification as Bureau
16	Exhibit 23 was received into
17	evidence.)
18	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Twenty-four?
19	MR. TOPEL: Yes, Your Honor, I would object to this
20	document as, as irrelevant. The this is a telephone
21	extension list of TBN that I believe the deposition testimony
22	during one of the days that Mr. Shook was not present, in his
23	defense, or in his support but, but this, this dates back
24 25	to the mid-1970's, it is my recollection, and, and I don't, I
23	don't know how Mr. Shook plans to tie this up to something

that's not already cumulatively in the record. 2 testimony about the relationships of all the various directors 3 That's certainly not something that's being hidden in 4 our case, and I, I just don't think this document is probative 5 of anything of value. 6 JUDGE CHACHKIN: Mr. Shook? 7 MR. SHOOK: Well, Your Honor, this was to show who 8 was -- who at Trinity was in the picture at the point in time 9 we believe this document was put together, and we believe it 10 was sometime either in 1979 or 1980, and our thought is that 11 it was sometime in 1980, and in that regard, this is simply to 12 give you an idea of who the various players are, and in some 13 respects I will, I will say that it is cumulative of other 14 material but it is illustrative of various individuals. 15 example, the upper left, accounting personnel, the first name 16 that appears is Bill Phipps. Well, Bill Phipps is a person 17 who comes into the picture a number of times during the period 18 of late 1980, because he's the person who is handling 19 Trinity's budget --20 JUDGE CHACHKIN: Well, let me just ask you one 21 question before you go on. My concern is there's no date on 22 Where, where did this document come from? it. 23 MR. TOPEL: It was produced in discovery in the 24 case. 25 JUDGE CHACHKIN: But there was nothing, no date,

1	placed on it when this
2	MR. TOPEL: Apparently not.
3	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Well, do you have in your
4	possession the original showing the date?
5	MR. TOPEL: I don't this would be I don't
6	think there's anything more to the document than this. There
7	was certainly everything we had was produced.
8	MR. COHEN: I think I can be helpful, Your Honor.
9	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Go ahead, Mr. Cohen.
10	MR. COHEN: I think I can be helpful. As Mr. Topel
11	accurately pointed out, this document was used in deposition.
12	It was used in connection with the deposition of
13	Armando Ramirez.
14	MR. TOPEL: Right.
15	MR. COHEN: And he identified and now I'm relying
16	on my recollection, I don't have the deposition in front of
17	me, Your Honor, but I think his he, he identified this
18	document as being prepared in the late seventies-ish, and he
19	will be available for testimony, so he can be examined on that
20	document.
21	MR. TOPEL: Yeah. My only I don't know that it
22	adds anything
23	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Well, it does in one document put
24	in, put into place who the persons were and what positions
25	they were, and what positions they held, and it's useful for

1 that nature. It's -- it shows the telephone extensions of the 2 various persons involved in different aspects involved in TBN. 3 MR. TOPEL: Well, I guess my, my only --4 Well, I can be helpful. It has to be MR. COHEN: 5 post-19 -- it has to be at least 1979 or '80 because Jane Duff 6 didn't become a vice president --7 That, that's correct. MR. TOPEL: 8 -- of TBN until, I believe the record MR. COHEN: 9 will reflect, the latter part of 1979 or early '80? 10 I think that's right and --MR. TOPEL: 11 MR. COHEN: So we know then -- we know that it has 12 to be at least as of that date. 13 Yeah. My, my concern, Your, Your Honor, MR. TOPEL: 14 I guess, is just the extent of examination this document might 15 warrant because the fact that someone has a telephone 16 extension doesn't, of course, mean that they're a full-time 17 fixture at TBN, and, and the, the background evidence that we 18 offered showing that a lot of these directors did other things 19 has been excluded from the record, and I would be concerned 20 if, if inferences were drawn that, for example, Pastor 21 Ramirez, I think his testimony does indicate that he is the 22 full-time pastor of El Silloway Church, but I'm not sure if 23 his testimony continues to reflect that he was the full-time 24 pastor of El Silloway Church from 1979 until the present, and 25 the time he spent at TBN, to put in context fairly, was he

1	put he was involved in one or two programs of, what, an
2	hour or two a week during that period. So I, I'm concerned
3	that, that the document could be misleading standing alone and
4	I'm just questioning whether it justifies a lot of examination
5	since, as Mr. Shook said, it's cumulative.
6	JUDGE CHACHKIN: I'll, I'll overrule your objection.
7	TBN Exhibit I mean, Bureau Exhibit 24 is received.
8	(Whereupon, the document previously
9	marked for identification as Bureau
10	Exhibit 24 was received into
11	evidence.)
12	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Twenty-five?
13	MR. TOPEL: Exhibit 25 I object to on the grounds of
14	relevance. I, I, I just don't know the purpose of the offer.
15	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Well, let's find out.
16	MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, I would direct your
17	attention to the first page. I will, I will state right now
18	that pages 2, 3, and 4, the Bureau does not intend to rely on
19	in terms of examination, but with respect to the first page,
20	the second full paragraph, which I will say is a little bit
21	difficult to read here because it's somewhat faded, but you
22	will note that the second sentence of that paragraph well,
23	I suppose it could be the third sentence. "We have filed new
24 25	FCC applications for 25 more cities across America, and
د ع	applications for 15 more are in preparation." The context of

1	this, and it is our understanding, that the "we" would be
2	inclusive of both Trinity and Translator TV because of the
3	number of applications filed and when they were filed.
4	MR. TOPEL: Excuse me, where is that language,
5	Mr. Shook?
6	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Yeah, where is the language? Where
7	is the language?
8	MR. SHOOK: Okay.
9	MR. TOPEL: I don't see.
10	MR. SHOOK: After "beloved partners," the second
11	paragraph, the first sentence there reads, "Last year, 1980,
12	saw" et cetera.
13	MR. TOPEL: Oh, I see it.
14	MR. SHOOK: Then if you move to, probably, what is
15	the third sentence, because if you count "Praise the Lord" as
16	a sentence that would be the second sentence, the third
17	sentence reads, "We have filed new FCC applications for 25
18	more cities across America, and applications for 15 more are
19	in preparation."
20	MR. TOPEL: Okay. I've got subject to it being
21	tied up on examination, I have no objection.
22	JUDGE CHACHKIN: All right, Bureau Exhibit 25 is
23	received.
24	(Whereupon, the document previously
25	marked for identification as Bureau

1	Exhibit 25 was received into
2	evidence.)
3	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Objection to Bureau Exhibit 26,
4	which is a minutes of an annual meeting of TBN, do you object
5	to that?
6	MR. TOPEL: I do, Your Honor, the on the issue of
7	loans to various organizations, we have provided a stipulation
8	on that, that issue. We were requested to do so, and other
9	than that I don't, I don't particularly see any relevance to
10	the document. I mean, I suppose if you, you've ruled on
11	this kind of thing. Perhaps Mr. Shook could, could indicate
12	and we could get a blanket ruling, because I do have a lot of
13	objections to a lot of TBN minutes that
14	JUDGE CHACHKIN: All right. Mr. Shook?
15	MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, we are concerned in
16	establishing a course of conduct with respect to TBN and its
17	dealings with other organizations. Some of those
18	organizations are covered in the stipulation. Unfortunately,
19	the stipulation did not go into the dealings between TBN and
20	other corporations with the Trinity name, such as Trinity
21	Broadcasting of Florida, Trinity Broadcasting of New York, et
22	cetera, and in this particular exhibit what we have is the
23	start of consideration by TBN of matters concerning Trinity
24	Broadcasting of Indiana.
25	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Bureau Exhibit 26 is received.

1	(Whereupon, the document previously
2	marked for identification as Bureau
3	Exhibit 26 was received into
4	evidence.)
5	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Twenty-seven?
6	MR. TOPEL: Okay, Your Honor, this comes under the
7	objections we have made regarding the tax-exempt application.
8	This is a this is correspondence regarding the preparation
9	of tax-exempt application for tax exemption, so it's, it's
10	within your prior rulings.
11	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Bureau Exhibit 27 is received.
12	(Whereupon, the document previously
13	marked for identification as Bureau
14	Exhibit 27 was received into
15	evidence.)
16	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Bureau Exhibit 29?
17	MR. TOPEL: Okay, I think this is in the category of
18	one we addressed
19	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Bureau Exhibit 29 is
20	MR. TOPEL: earlier, Your Honor. I, I, I gather
21	the Bureau is going to try attempt to tie this on, on
22	examination. I have no objection if it's tied.
23	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Bureau
24 25	MR. SHOOK: We will certainly endeavor.
د ع	JUDGE CHACHKIN: All right, Bureau Exhibit 29 is

1	received.
2	(Whereupon, the document previously
3	marked for identification as Bureau
4	Exhibit 29 was received into
5	evidence.)
6	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Bureau Exhibit 30?
7	MR. TOPEL: This comes under the tax exempt. You've
8	overruled my objection.
9	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Bureau Exhibit 30 is, is received.
10	(Whereupon, the document previously
11	marked for identification as Bureau
12	Exhibit 30 was received into
13	evidence.)
14	JUDGE CHACHKIN: The next one is 31.
15	MR. TOPEL: Yes, the same thing, Your Honor.
16	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Bureau Exhibit 31 is received.
17	(Whereupon, the document previously
18	marked for identification as Bureau
19	Exhibit 31 was received into
20	evidence.)
21	JUDGE CHACHKIN: The next one is
22	MR. TOPEL: Well, Your Honor, back, back up. On, on
23	31
24 25	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Yes?
د ع	MR. TOPEL: I'm a little concerned because we

1	MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, if I may, I believe this
2	maybe it's even identical to one of Glendale's exhibits. I
3	seem to remember
4	MR. COHEN: I think that's the case.
5	MR. TOPEL: There were several versions of this
6	response, and
7	MR. COHEN: Can I Your Honor, can I explain this?
8	And I think then we can arrive at an agreement among the
9	parties.
10	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Go ahead.
11	MR. COHEN: Okay. I learned this from the
12	deposition. Apparently, the problem is the date. The
13	document, one, one response was dated January '80, and one was
14	dated January '81, I think. Isn't that the problem?
15	MR. TOPEL: No, well, there were, there were two
16	problems. One, where there was a problem in the Internal
17	Revenue Service
18	MR. COHEN: Yes.
19	MR. TOPEL: that failed to roll its date stamp,
20	and so it was using the year, year January 1980, when it
21	should have been using January 1981.
22	MR. COHEN: Exactly, exactly, that's it.
23	MR. TOPEL: I think that problem lives in your
24 25	exhibit, Mr. Cohen but so be it. The, the second is that
	there were two drafts of this particular response and I

1	believe Mr. Cohen's initial exchange had both of them, and I
2	made a note to myself there that we ought to use the one that
3	was actually the response if, if it's going
4	MR. COHEN: I agree.
5	MR. TOPEL: to be received.
6	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Which one is the actual response?
7	MR. TOPEL: I think it's the, the would be the,
8	the later one, I think.
9	MR. COHEN: I agree with you.
10	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Which is which?
11	MR. TOPEL: I'd have to
12	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Thirty-one?
13	MR. SHOOK: Well, Your Honor
14	MR. TOPEL: No, it would 31 is an unsigned one
15	and, and
16	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Oh, I see. Is there one with a,
17	with a
18	MR. TOPEL: there, there is an actual signed one.
19	MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, we can withdraw Exhibit 31.
20	JUDGE CHACHKIN: All right, Bureau Exhibit 31 has
21	been withdrawn.
22	(Whereupon, the document previously
23	marked for identification and
24 25	received into evidence as Bureau
23	Exhibit 31 was withdrawn.)

JUDGE CHACHKIN: The next one is 35.
MR. TOPEL: Okay, this comes, again, under the tax
exempt application matter.
JUDGE CHACHKIN: Bureau Exhibit 35 is received.
(Whereupon, the document previously
marked for identification as Bureau
Exhibit 35 was received into
evidence.)
JUDGE CHACHKIN: Thirty-six, is that similar? It
looks like it. Thirty-six will also be received.
MR. TOPEL: Yeah.
JUDGE CHACHKIN: There is a response there. Is that
the one that
MR. TOPEL: No, that, that's a different one and I
am that, that's unsigned. I don't know if we ever
had a signed copy. Maybe Mr. Shook can help me, but I know on
the earlier one there were signed copies, the one that's been
withdrawn.
JUDGE CHACHKIN: This is June '81 now.
MR. TOPEL: Excuse me?
JUDGE CHACHKIN: This is June '81 that you've opened
up.
MR. TOPEL: Yeah. Yeah.
MR. SHOOK: Where possible, Your Honor, we
endeavored to include signed copies. Unfortunately, we

1	couldn't always find signed copies.
2	JUDGE CHACHKIN: All right, I will receive Bureau
3	Exhibit 36; Bureau Exhibit 36 is received.
4	(Whereupon, the document previously
5	marked for identification as Bureau
6	Exhibit 36 was received into
7	evidence.)
8	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Now we're at 42.
9	MR. TOPEL: In subject to being tied up, I
10	withdraw my objection.
11	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Bureau Exhibit 42 is received.
12	(Whereupon, the document previously
13	marked for identification as Bureau
14	Exhibit 42 was received into
15	evidence.)
16	JUDGE CHACHKIN: All right, 44. Any objection?
17	MR. TOPEL: I'll state it on the record, Your Honor.
18	I, I, I think the law of the case is established on the
19	receipt of TBN minutes, and I understand think, well,
20	some let me see, can I have 1 second with this?
21	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Yes.
22	(Pause.)
23	MR. TOPEL: Well, if I'm correct, I understood the
24 25	Bureau's offer of this is to say something about the
25	relationship between TBN and Trinity Broadcasting of New

1	York
_	
2	MR. SHOOK: It is, Your Honor.
3	MR. TOPEL: and the history of that. It, it
4	remains our position that that's not relevant to the control
5	of NMTV.
6	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Bureau Exhibit 44 is received.
7	(Whereupon, the document previously
8	marked for identification as Bureau
9	Exhibit 44 was received into
10	evidence.)
11	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Forty-five, which is another
12	"Praise the Lord" newsletter.
13	MR. TOPEL: Yes, again, I would, I would ask that
14	Mr. Shook state the purpose of the offer.
15	MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, may we go off the record for
16	1 second, please?
17	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Yes.
18	(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)
19	JUDGE CHACHKIN: the record.
20	MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, there are two aspects to
21	this newsletter that we wish to bring into the record. The
22	first is the references, and you will see them toward the
23	bottom of the newsletter in fact, it appears on the
24	second-to-last line TBN is representing to its supporters
25	that the station in New York, which they ultimately, which TBN

ultimately, did through Trinity Broadcasting of New York obtain a license for, was going to reach, or have a potential 3 to reach 16 million persons. In an application that was 4 filed -- in applications that were filed with the FCC in 1987 5 relative to the Odessa and Portland stations that National 6 Minority acquired, one of the representations that TBN made 7 was that the New York station reached only 200,000 households. Now, we would like to explore with Dr. Crouch the differences 9 between the representation made, not only here but in other 10 newsletters for several years thereafter, relative to the 11 coverage of New York and the representations that were made to 12 the FCC in the Odessa and Portland applications, and those 13 representations were made in connection with National Minority 14 TV telling the Commission that the interests of Paul Crouch 15 were not going to run afoul of the national multiple ownership 16 The second aspect of this newsletter that we wish to 17 have as part of the record appears on the second page, and 18 that is the -- an awareness, a knowledge, on the part of 19 Paul Crouch how many stations TBN and its affiliates, in this 20 case it would be Trinity Broadcasting of New York, have or 21 will have, and in this case there is a -- let's see if I can 22 find it here -- oh, Your Honor, it would be about one-third 23 down on the page, and it begins, the paragraph begins, 24 "Partners, will you go with us one more time? This would be 25 station number six. Only one more to go," et cetera. The

thought here is that this is one of the pieces of evidence
that establishes Paul Crouch's awareness of what the multiple
ownership limitations are and how you know, what
problems or how to deal with those limitations as the years
passed.
MR. TOPEL: I'll, I'll withdraw my I mean, I will
withdraw my objection subject to it being tied on examination.
JUDGE CHACHKIN: Bureau Exhibit 45 is received.
(Whereupon, the document previously
marked for identification as Bureau
Exhibit 45 was received into
evidence.)
JUDGE CHACHKIN: Forty-eight? Forty-six. I'll
receive 46.
MR. TOPEL: Yes.
(Whereupon, the document previously
marked for identification as Bureau
Exhibit 46 was received into
evidence.)
JUDGE CHACHKIN: Then we go on to 51.
MR. TOPEL: For that one 51, I don't have I
not stated a position on 51?
JUDGE CHACHKIN: Yes, you have. Bureau Exhibit 51
s received.
(Whereupon, the document previously

1	marked for identification as Bureau
2	Exhibit 51 was received into
3	evidence.)
4	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Fifty-two.
5	MR. TOPEL: The next one, I okay, 52 should have
6	been in my list of matters to which we don't object to their
7	being tied. I apologize if it wasn't.
8	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Bureau Exhibit 52 is received.
9	(Whereupon, the document previously
10	marked for identification as Bureau
11	Exhibit 52 was received into
12	evidence.)
13	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Fifty-four? What is there in this
14	newsletter?
15	MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, we've now hit the first
16	national multiple ownership limitation, that is, number seven.
17	Seattle/Takoma is going to be station number seven. They're
18	just about to obtain, or I believe, I guess, at this point
19	they've signed a contract for it, and 54 also becomes
20	important from the standpoint of being able to tie in a
21	reference in a later newsletter which talks about Seattle, but
22	there's a problem with the date, and I can bring you to that
23	immediately so you'll know what I'm talking about. That's
24 25	Exhibit 56. If you look at 56, the third page, it reads,
4.0	"Praise-a-thon '82 Projects" on the top, and there might be

some question as to whether or not this page and the following 1 2 pages belong with this newsletter, and, I believe -- now I'm 3 not sure if I'm going to be able to establish it in, in 4 anyone's testimony but I believe that this really should have 5 been "Praise-a-thon '83" not "Praise-a-thon '82" projects, and then the following projects tie into this, and one way to see 6 7 that is when you move to page 4 of our exhibit, you will notice down at the bottom right-hand corner, there is a reference to Seattle, and that reference could not have been there if this were really a, you know, "Praise-a-thon '82" 10 11 matter. 12 MR. TOPEL: Which -- I'm sorry, where, where is the 13 reference to Seattle that's in Exhibit --14 It's in Exhibit 56, the fourth page of MR. SHOOK: 15 our exhibit, the bottom right-hand corner. 16 MR. TOPEL: I see. I see. 17 And so the principal reason why I have MR. SHOOK: 18 54 in is just to establish that what appears in Exhibit 56 is 19 appropriate -- you know, appropriately belongs with 20 Exhibit 56. 21 MR. TOPEL: Well, that's, that's fair enough. 22 me say, Your Honor, I -- subject to it being tied -- in fact, 23 I'll off the record undertake to see if I can help Mr. Shook 24 out to save some hearing room time for, for all of us, but I 25 withdraw my objection subject to it being -- subject to -- I

1	guess we're talking about 54 being tied.
2	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Bureau Exhibits 54 and 56 are
3	received.
4	(Whereupon, the documents previously
5	marked for identification as Bureau
6	Exhibits 54 and 56 were received into
7	evidence.)
8	MR. TOPEL: My notes were that I had not objected to
9	56, Your Honor. Had, had you not had I not indicated that
10	to you?
11	JUDGE CHACHKIN: No, you had not.
12	MR. TOPEL: I apologize.
13	JUDGE CHACHKIN: All right, 57? I'll receive 57.
14	(Whereupon, the document previously
15	marked for identification as Bureau
16	Exhibit 57 was received into
17	evidence.)
18	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Fifty-eight also relates minutes of
19	a meeting or a meeting. I'll receive that.
20	(Whereupon, the document previously
21	marked for identification as Bureau
22	Exhibit 58 was received into
23	evidence.)
24	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Sixty is another newsletter.
25	MR. TOPEL: Your Honor, with your indulgence, and

	1203
1	obviously you'll cut me off if I'm out of line, I, I don't
2	understand
3	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Fifty-eight?
4	MR. TOPEL: the 57 and 58 minutes because they
5	don't relate to relationships with other affiliates.
6	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Well, let's find out from the
7	Bureau.
8	MR. TOPEL: All right.
9	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Fifty-seven and fifty-eight.
10	MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, there is testimony in
11	Colby May's exhibit that brings to the fore this date, May 27,
12	1983. On this date, the FCC's lottery report and order came
13	out and described what preferences would be given for
14	applicants who were going to be involved in a low-power
15	lottery. One of those preferences was a diversification
16	preference. The activities that take place in Exhibits 57 and
17	58 tie into that.
18	MR. TOPEL: Well, I, I certainly don't think that
19	that's been established. It may, may tied into Mr. Shook's
20	theory of something.
21	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Well, we'll see subject
22	MR. TOPEL: Okay.
23	JUDGE CHACHKIN: I will, I will receive it subject
24 25	to being tied in.
43	

MR. COHEN: What exhibit is that, Your Honor?

1	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Fifty-seven and fifty-eight.
2	MR. COHEN: What did you admit 55?
3	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Fifty-five was received, yes.
4	There was no objection to it well, I did receive it. There
5	was objection and I received it. We're now at 60, which is
6	another newsletter. What, what in this document is relevant?
7	MR. SHOOK: Again, Your Honor, it is simply the
8	reference to New York and the number of people that the
9	station can reach, and that appears on the second page.
10	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Bureau Exhibit 60 is received.
11	(Whereupon, the document previously
12	marked for identification as Bureau
13	Exhibit 60 was received into
14	evidence.)
15	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Next one is Bureau Exhibit 61.
16	MR. TOPEL: Your Honor, is it is my understanding
17	correct that, that these documents, then, are, are limited for
18	the purpose for which they're used on examination?
19	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Yes.
20	MR. TOPEL: That's my objection.
21	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Yes, they are.
22	MR. TOPEL: Okay, because otherwise
23	MR. SHOOK: I can represent that with and
24 25	certainly with respect to this exhibit, for example, there
4 3	would be absolutely no other purpose for which we would use

1	that.
2	MR. TOPEL: Yeah.
3	JUDGE CHACHKIN: All right.
4	MR. TOPEL: Because otherwise I, obviously, have a
5	massive amount of material to try to figure out.
6	JUDGE CHACHKIN: Oh, I understand that. Sixty-one?
7	MR. TOPEL: Once
8	MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, if I may, also with respect
9	to 60, I wish to bring to your attention a listing of stations
10	that appears at the top on the first page. The Bureau would
11	also make reference to that.
12	MR. TOPEL: That's on 60?
13	MR. SHOOK: Yes.
14	MR. TOPEL: Okay. Your Honor, I don't give me
15	one second, Your Honor, with 61. I don't
16	(Pause.)
17	MR. TOPEL: Oh, I have no objection to this subject
18	to it being tied up.
19	JUDGE CHACHKIN: All right, 61 is received.
20	(Whereupon, the document previously
21	marked for identification as Bureau
22	Exhibit 61 was received into
23	evidence.)
24 25	MR. TOPEL: If I may ask Mr. Shook, isn't there
23	description of this document in the stipulation?